

film coated on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film.”

None of the cited references including the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 10-14, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “providing a second substrate having first and second surfaces, wherein the first surface is disposed against the first substrate; coating a non-transparent film on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and disposing a sheet material between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film.” None of the cited references including the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 and claims 16-23, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner cites the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 as disclosing “a sheet material (10) disposed between the light source (20) and the second substrate (6), ...a black pattern (24) (non-transparent film)... printed on the left edge of the protective sheet (10a) and ...on the lower surface of the second substrate (6).” (Office Action at 2.) Further, in the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action mailed 1/27/03, the Examiner states “at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) (such as the protective sheet 10a) is

not directly under the black [pattern] (24) (as the non-transparent film, see the Fig. 1 left edge of the protective sheet (10a))..." (Office Action at 5.) The Examiner then states the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 "does not expressly disclose a non-transparent film coated on periphery of the second surface (lower surface) of the second substrate." (Office Action at 2.)

Further, in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action mailed 1/27/03, the Examiner states "at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) (such as the protective sheet (10a) is not directly under the black [pattern] (24) (as the non-transparent film, see the Fig. 1 left edge of the protective sheet (10a))...or it can also be read as at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) (such as the protective sheet (10a) is not directly under the black matrix (26) (as a non-transparent film, see the Fig. 1, left edge of the protective sheet (10a), because there is a black [pattern] (24) between the black matrix (26) and a portion of the protective sheet (10a))..." (Office Action at 5).

Initially, and in view of the Examiner's statements above, Applicant respectfully submits it appears as though the Examiner is interpreting both the black matrix 26 and the black pattern 24 of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 to read on the "non-transparent film" as claimed in claims 1 and 15. Assuming, *arguendo*, that a black matrix layer may be non-transparent, Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the black matrix 26 of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 cannot be interpreted to read on the "non-transparent film" as claimed in claims 1 and 15. Applicant respectfully submits the aforementioned interpretation of the black matrix 26 of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 is incorrect because the "non-transparent film" as claimed in claims 1 and 15 is formed on the second surface of the second substrate, wherein the second substrate has first and second surfaces,

and wherein the first surface is disposed against the first substrate. The black matrix 26 of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, however, is formed on the surface of the substrate that is disposed against the first substrate (4). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the black matrix 26 of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 cannot be interpreted as being the "non-transparent film coated in ... the second surface of the second substrate" as claimed in claims 1 and 15.

After citing what the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 allegedly disclosed, the Examiner states the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 "does not expressly disclose a non-transparent film coated on periphery of the second surface (lower surface) of the second substrate." (Office Action at 2.)

In attempting to cure the deficiencies of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, the Examiner cites Suzuki et al. as disclosing "...a liquid crystal display device having a shield tape (TAPE) is stuck to the lower face of the lower substrate (SUB1)... [and] the shield tape (TAPE) is coated on the periphery of the lower face of the lower substrate." The Examiner then concludes "it would have been obvious to... use a non-transparent black film coated on periphery of the lower surface of the lower substrate as claimed in claims 1 and 15 for preventing the light leakage from the back light and achieving an excellent display quality..."

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the references when combined. See M.P.E.P. § 2413. Applicant respectfully submits a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the rejection of the aforementioned claims.

For example, the cited combination of references (i.e., related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 in view of Suzuki et al.) fails to teach or suggest at least "...a non-transparent film on a

periphery of the second surface of the second substrate..." and "a sheet material between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film."

Assuming, *arguendo*, and in a manner consistent with the Examiner's interpretation of the cited references, that (a): the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 shows wherein the non-transparent film (24) is formed on a surface of a substrate (6) that is not disposed against another substrate (4), wherein at least a portion of one edge of sheet material (10a) is not directly under the non-transparent film (24); and (b) Figure 9 of Suzuki et al. shows a non-transparent film (TAPE) is formed on a periphery of a surface of a substrate (SUB 1) that is not disposed against another substrate (SUB 2), Applicant respectfully submits the cited combination of Suzuki et al. and the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 still does not teach or suggest the claimed invention because Suzuki et al. also shows wherein the non-transparent film (TAPE) extends to the edge of the substrate (SUB1). See also, Suzuki et al. at column 13, lines 8-11, disclosing "...the shield tape (TAPE) is stuck through an adhesive layer to the lower face of the lower transparent glass substrate SUB 1 from the seal member SL to the end portion of the substrate SUB 1..."

Applicant respectfully submits importing the non-transparent film (TAPE) of Suzuki et al. to replace the non-transparent film (24) of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 would necessarily provide a non-transparent film that extends to the edge of substrate (6). Referring to the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, at page 3, lines 17-20 of the present application, "...the lower glass substrate 6 of the liquid crystal panel is formed larger than the upper glass substrate 4..."

Therefore, in the structure defined by the cited combination of references (i.e., the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 in view of Suzuki et al.), at least a portion of one edge of sheet material (10a), originally supplied by the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, would necessarily be directly under the non-transparent film imported from Suzuki et al. into the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the cited combination of references actually teaches away from the claimed combination of elements cited above.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit there is no suggestion, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the teachings of either the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al. in any manner and obtain, for example, a non-transparent film formed on a surface of a substrate that is not disposed against another substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film, as required by the aforementioned claims. Rather, Applicant respectfully submits that such modification is suggested only by the claimed invention and to do so would necessitate considerable impermissible hindsight. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection as a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 09/394,379  
Group Art Unit: 2871

Docket No.: 8733.088.00  
Page 8

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP

Date: May 20, 2003

By



Song K. Jung  
Registration No.: 35,210

Kurt M. Eaton  
Registration No.: 51,640

1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756